Case 1:08-cv-00696-AKH	Document 1	Filed 01/07/2008	Page 1 of 11
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YOR	K		
IN RE WORLD TRADE CENTER DISASTER SITE LITIGATION		21 MC 100 (AKH)	
MIGUEL HERNANDEZ		DOCKET NO.	
- against - A RUSSO WRECKING, ET. AL.,	intiffs,	CHECK-OFF ("SH COMPLAINT RELATED TO THI MASTER COMPLAINTIFF(S) DEN JURY	Ξ
SEE ATTACHED RIDER,			
Def	endants.		
By Order of the Honorable Alv 2006, ("the Order"), Amended Master C			_
	NOTICE OI	F ADOPTION	
All headings and paragraphs in instant Phintiff(s) as if fully set forth l Plaintiff(s), which are listed below. These	nerein in additi	on to those paragraphs	specific to the individ

the lual f(s), and specific case information is set forth, as needed, below.

Plaintiffs, MIGUEL HERNANDEZ, by his/her/their attorneys WORBY GRONER EDELMAN & NAPOLI BERN, LLP, complaining of Defendant(s), respectfully allege:

PARTIES

A. PLAINTIFF(S)

1. individual ar			er the "Injured Plaintiff"), is an
individual and a citizen of New York residing at PO Box 204, Montgomery, NY 12549 (OR)			
2.	Alternatively, \square	(/	of Decedent
, and brings this claim in his (her) capacity as of the Estate of			

Ca	ise 1.06-cv-00696-ARH Documen	it i Filed 01/07/2006 Page 2 01 11
3.		(hereinafter the "Derivative Plaintiff"), is a
		, and has the following relationship to the
Injured Plaint	SPOUSE at all relevant times, and bri injuries sustained by her husba	herein, is and has been lawfully married to Plaintiff ngs this derivative action for her (his) loss due to the and (his wife), Plaintiff Other:
4.		2001 the Injured Plaintiff worked for New York
	tment (NYPD) as a Police Officer at:	2001 the figured Flamuit worked for New Tork
	Please be as specific as possible when f	illing in the following dates and locations
		=====================================
	d Trade Center Site	☐ The Barge
Location(s) (i.e., building, quadrant, etc.)	From on or about until; Approximately hours per day; for
	bout <u>9/12/2001</u> until <u>9/14/2001</u> ;	Approximately days total.
	ly <u>12</u> hours per day; for ly 2 days total.	
========	=======================================	Other:* For injured plaintiffs who worked at Non-WTC Site building or location. The injured
	York City Medical Examiner's Office	plaintiff worked at the address/location, for the
	bout, until, ly hours per day; for	dates alleged, for the hours per day, for the total
Approximate	ly days total.	days, and for the employer, as specified below:
	======================================	From on or about;
	bout;	Approximately hours per day; for
Approximate	ly hours per day; for	Approximately days total; Name and Address of Non-WTC Site
Approximate	ly days total.	Building/Worksite:
*Continue t		aper if necessary. If more space is needed to specify rate sheet of paper with the information.
5.	Injured Plaintiff	
	✓ Was exposed to and breathed above;	noxious fumes on all dates, at the site(s) indicated
	✓ Was exposed to and inhaled or dates at the site(s) indicated above;	r ingested toxic substances and particulates on all
	✓ Was exposed to and absorbed the site(s) indicated above;	or touched toxic or caustic substances on all dates at
	✓ Other: Not yet determined.	

6.

Injure	ed Plaintiff
V	Has not made a claim to the Victim Compensation Fund. Pursuant to $$405(c)(3)(B)(i)$ of the Air Transportation Safety and System Stabilization Act, 49 U.S.C. $$40101$, the issue of waiver is inapplicable.
	Made a claim to the Victim Compensation Fund that was denied. Pursuant to § $405(c)(3)(B)(i)$ of the Air Transportation Safety and System Stabilization Act, 49 U.S.C. § 40101, the issue of waiver is inapplicable.
	Made a claim to the Victim Compensation Fund, that was subsequently withdrawn by Ground-Zero Plaintiff. Pursuant to § 405(c)(3)(B)(i) of the Air Transportation Safety and System Stabilization Act, 49 U.S.C. § 40101, the issue of waiver is inapplicable.
	Made a claim to the Victim Compensation Fund that was granted. Pursuant to § $405(c)(3)(B)(i)$ of the Air Transportation Safety and System Stabilization Act, 49 U.S.C. § 40101, Ground Zero-Plaintiff has waived her/his right(s) to pursue any further legal action for the injuries identified in said claim.

B. DEFENDANT(S)

The following is a list of all Defendant(s) named in the Master Complaint. If checked, all paragraphs pertaining to that Defendant are deemed pleaded herein.

☐ THE CITY OF NEW YORK	☑ A RUSSO WRECKING
☐ A Notice of Claim was timely filed and	☑ ABM INDUSTRIES, INC.
served on and	☑ ABM JANITORIAL NORTHEAST, INC.
	☑ AMEC CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT,
☐ pursuant to General Municipal Law §50-	INC.
h the CITY held a hearing on(OR)	☑ AMEC EARTH & ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.
\Box The City has yet to hold a hearing as	☑ ANTHONY CORTESE SPECIALIZED
required by General Municipal Law §50-h	HAULING, LLC, INC.
\square More than thirty days have passed and	☑ ATLANTIC HEYDT CORP
the City has not adjusted the claim	☑ BECHTEL ASSOCIATES PROFESSIONAL
(OR)	CORPORATION
☐ An Order to Show Cause application to	☑ BECHTEL CONSTRUCTION, INC.
deem Plaintiff's (Plaintiffs') Notice of	☑ BECHTEL CORPORATION
Claim timely filed, or in the alternative to grant	☑ BECHTEL ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.
Plaintiff(s) leave to file a late Notice of Claim	☑ BERKEL & COMPANY, CONTRACTORS,
Nunc Pro Tunc (for leave to file a late Notice of	INC.
Claim <i>Nunc Pro Tunc</i>) has been filed and a	☑ BIG APPLE WRECKING & CONSTRUCTION
determination	CORP
\square is pending	\square BOVIS LEND LEASE, INC.
☐ Granting petition was made on	☑ BOVIS LEND LEASE LMB, INC.
☐ Denying petition was made on	☑ BREEZE CARTING CORP
	☑ BREEZE NATIONAL, INC.
☐ PORT AUTHORITY OF NEW YORK AND	☑ BRER-FOUR TRANSPORTATION CORP.
NEW JERSEY ["PORT AUTHORITY"]	☑ BURO HAPPOLD CONSULTING ENGINEERS,
☐ A Notice of Claim was filed and served	P.C.
pursuant to Chapter 179, §7 of The	☑ C.B. CONTRACTING CORP
Unconsolidated Laws of the State of New	☑ CANRON CONSTRUCTION CORP
York on	☐ CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF
☐ More than sixty days have elapsed since	NEW YORK, INC.
the Notice of Claim was filed, (and)	☑ CORD CONTRACTING CO., INC ☐ CRAIG TEST BORING COMPANY INC.
☐ the PORT AUTHORITY has	☐ CRAIG TEST BORING COMPANT INC. ☐ DAKOTA DEMO-TECH
adjusted this claim	☑ DAROTA DEMO-TECH ☑ DIAMOND POINT EXCAVATING CORP
☐ the PORT AUTHORITY has not	☑ DIAMOND FORT EXCAVATING CORT ☑ DIEGO CONSTRUCTION, INC.
adjusted this claim.	☑ DIEGO CONSTRUCTION, INC. ☑ DIVERSIFIED CARTING, INC.
=======================================	☑ DATE ENTERPRISE, INC.
☐ 1 WORLD TRADE CENTER, LLC	☑ D'ONOFRIO GENERAL CONTRACTORS
□ 1 WTC HOLDINGS, LLC	CORP
☐ 2 WORLD TRADE CENTER, LLC	☑ EAGLE LEASING & INDUSTRIAL SUPPLY
□ 2 WTC HOLDINGS, LLC	☑ EAGLE ONE ROOFING CONTRACTORS INC.
☐ 4 WORLD TRADE CENTER, LLC	☐ EAGLE SCAFFOLDING CO, INC.
□ 4 WTC HOLDINGS, LLC	☑ EJ DAVIES, INC.
□ 5 WORLD TRADE CENTER, LLC	☑ EN-TECH CORP
□ 5 WTC HOLDINGS, LLC	□ ET ENVIRONMENTAL
☐ 7 WORLD TRADE COMPANY, L.P.	□Evans Environmental

Please read this document carefully.

It is very important that you fill out each and every section of this document.

Please read this document carefully.

☐ OTHER:

It is very important that you fill out each and every section of this document.

☐ Non-WTC Site Building Owner	☐ Non-WTC Site Building Managing Agent
Name:	Name:
Business/Service Address:	
Building/Worksite Address:	Building/Worksite Address:
☐ Non-WTC Site Lessee	•
Name:	
Business/Service Address:	
Building/Worksite Address:	

Case 1:08-cv-00696-AKH Document 1 Filed 01/07/2008 Page 7 of 11 II. JURISDICTION

The Court's jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action is:

Stabil	ounded upon Federal Question Jurisdiction; specization Act of 2001, (or); ☐ Federal Officers ☐; ☐ Contested, boxal jurisdiction over this action, pursuant to 28	Jurisd ut the	iction, (or); Other (specify): Court has already determined that it has
	III CAUSES	S OF	ACTION
of lial	, ,		d defendants based upon the following theories a such a claim under the applicable substantive
V	Breach of the defendants' duties and obligations pursuant to the New York State Labor Law(s) including §§ 200 and 240	V	Common Law Negligence, including allegations of Fraud and Misrepresentation
V	Breach of the defendants' duties and obligations pursuant to the New York State Labor Law 241(6)		 ✓ Air Quality; ✓ Effectiveness of Mask Provided; ☐ Effectiveness of Other Safety Equipment Provided
	Pursuant to New York General Municipal Law §205-a		(specify:); ✓ Other(specify): Not yet determined
V	Pursuant to New York General Municipal Law §205-e		Wrongful Death
			Loss of Services/Loss of Consortium for Derivative Plaintiff

Other: _

Case 1:08-cv-00696-AKH Document 1 Filed 01/07/2008 Page 8 of 11 IV CAUSATION, INJURY AND DAMAGE

1. As a direct and proximate result of defendant's culpable actions in the rescue and/or recovery and/or construction, renovation, alteration, demolition and all work performed at the premises, the Injured Plaintiff sustained (including, but not limited to) the following injuries:

☐ Cardiovascular Injury: N/A.

☐ Cancer Injury: N/A.

	Date of onset: Date physician first connected this injury to WTC work:		Date of onset: Date physician first connected this injury to WTC work:
	Respiratory Injury: N/A. Date of onset: Date physician first connected this injury to WTC work:		Fear of Cancer Date of onset: 11/6/2007 Date physician first connected this injury to WTC work: To be supplied at a later date
	Digestive Injury: N/A. Date of onset: Date physician first connected this injury to WTC work:	V	Other Injury: Sleeping Problems Date of onset: 11/6/2007 Date physician first connected this injury to WTC work: To be supplied at a later date
Groundama	nd Zero-Plaintiff has in the past suffered and/or	the inju	ries identified in paragraph "1", above, the
✓	Pain and suffering		
\checkmark	Loss of the enjoyment of life		
✓	Loss of earnings and/or impairment of earning capacity		
\checkmark	Loss of retirement benefits/diminution of		
V	retirement benefits Expenses for medical care, treatment, and rehabilitation		
\checkmark	Other: ☑ Mental anguish ☑ Disability ☑ Medical monitoring ☑ Other: Not yet determined.		

3. As a direct and proximate result of the injuries described *supra*, the derivative plaintiff(s), if any, have in the past suffered and/or will in the future suffer a loss of the love, society, companionship, services, affection, and support of the plaintiff and such other losses, injuries and damages for which compensation is legally appropriate.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff(s) respectfully pray that the Court enter judgment in his/her/their favor and against defendant(s) for damages, costs of suit and such other, further and different relief as may be just and appropriate.

Plaintiff(s) demands that all issues of fact in this case be tried before a properly empanelled jury.

Dated: New York, New York January 3, 2008

Yours, etc.,

Worby, Groner Edelman & Napoli Bern, LLP

Attorneys for Plaintiff(s), Miguel Hernandez

By:

Christopher R. LoPalo (CL 6466)

115 Broadway 12th Floor

New York, New York 10006

Phone: (212) 267-3700

ATTORNEY VERIFICATION

CHRISTOPHER R. LOPALO, an attorney at law, duly admitted to practice in the Courts of the State of New York, affirms under the penalties of perjury that:

He is the attorney for the plaintiff(s) in the above-entitled action.

That he has read the foregoing SUMMONS AND VERIFIED COMPLAINT and knows

the contents thereof, and upon information and belief, deponent believes

the matters alleged therein to be true.

The reason this Verification is made by deponent and not by the plaintiff(s) is that the plaintiff(s) herein reside(s) in a county other than the one in which the plaintiff's attorneys maintain their office.

The source of deponent's information and the grounds of his belief are communication, papers, reports and investigation contained in the file.

DATED: New York, New York
January 3, 2008

CHRISTOPHER R. LOPALO

Docket No: UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK MIGUEL HERNANDEZ, Plaintiff(s) - against -A RUSSO WRECKING, ET. AL., Defendant(s). SUMMONS AND VERIFIED COMPLAINT WORBY GRONER EDELMAN & NAPOLI BERN, LLP Attorneys for: Plaintiff(s) Office and Post Office Address, Telephone 115 Broadway - 12th Floor New York, New York 10006 (212) 267-3700 To Attorney(s) for Service of a copy of the within is hereby admitted. Dated, Attorney(s) for PLEASE TAKE NOTICE: \square NOTICE OF ENTRY that the within is a (certified) true copy of an duly entered in the office of the clerk of the within named court on □ NOTICE OF SETTLEMENT that an order of which the within is a true copy will be presented for settlement to the HON. one of the judges of the within named Court, at 20 at $\mathbf{M}.$ Dated, Yours, etc.,

WORBY GRONER EDELMAN & NAPOLI BERN, LLP